

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed 08/29/2007, the amendment mailed 07/16/2007 is reproduced herein in its entirety using bold font.

A petition and fee for an extension of time for three months until 07/23/2007 is filed herewith.

In paragraph 2, claims 8, 33, and 58 are objected to for lack of antecedent for "the request". Claims 8, 33, and 58 are amended wherein the term "and the initiating of the request are" is deleted.

Further, claims 3, 10, 28, 35, 53, and 60 are amended to provide an antecedent for "alert message."

Claims 4, 11, 29, 36, 54, and 61 are amended to correct a typographical error by changing "language)" to --language--. Claim 3 has further been amended to correct a typographical error by changing "que" to --cue--.

Claims 17 and 67 are amended to correct a typographical error by changing "gui" to --GUI--.

Claims 20, 45, and 70 are amended to correct a typographical error by inserting --wherein--.

In paragraphs 3, 4, and 5, claims 8-25, 33-50, and 58-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 8, 33, and 58 are amended to claim that the extracting, creating, and displaying steps are done at the second computer system. As noted by the examiner, the performing of these steps at the first computer system was in error.

In paragraphs 6-23, claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-17, 21, 26-30, 32-36, 38-42, 46, 51-55, 57-61, 63-67, and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(30 as being anticipated by Gupta et al (herein

Gupta), U.S. Publication No 2002/0099777 A1. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Gupta describes a system and method for integrating collaboration activities into email. The term "collaborative message" is used to describe this special email. The collaborative message includes a query portion 132, a feedback portion 134, a respondents portion 136, and an attachment portion 138 (see FIG. 2). At paragraph [0050], examples of collaborative email have been given to include, new message icon, a menu selection, a control-key sequence, a particular one of multiple templates or forms stored by the email program, forwarding templates or forms stored by the email program, and forwarding of a previously received collaborative email message.

Independent claims 1, 26, and 51 have been amended to make clear that the claimed message from the first computer system is a notification of an event external to the second computer system. Further, claims 1, 26, and 51 are amended to make clear that the message from the first computer includes aspects of how the second computer system it to display the message content. This is supported at paragraph [0019] wherein the invention is described as providing the capability to create, send or receive alert notifications that include the instructions of how they might be experienced (displayed, interacted with or expressed) independent of the protocol, device, and environment or location. This is further claimed as the GUI message attributes and GUI message functionality which is included in the message. Further, claims 1, 26 and 51 have been amended to make clear that each computer system in the group of computer systems is anonymous to the first computer system and the other computer systems in the group of computer systems. This is supported in paragraphs [0060] and [0061] of the specification. In Gupta, messages are sent for group collaboration and the list of

respondents is shown in the respondents' portion 136. In the example of FIG. 2, the respondents are indented to indicate which recipient's comments were already entered at the time the comment was made (see paragraph [0038]). Thus in Gupta, the computer systems of the group of computer systems to which the message is sent are not anonymous to one another, as claimed.

Independent claims 8, 33, and 58 have been amended to make clear that the message is a notification of an event which is external to the second computer system. Further, claims 8, 33, and 58 are amended to make clear that the second computer system is anonymous to the first computer system and other computer systems. Further, claims 8, 33, and 58 have been amended to make clear the message includes aspects of how the second computer is to display the message. Further, claims 8, 33, and 58 have been amended to make clear that the aspects including attributes and functionality and content which are extracted from the message at the second computer system, and claims 8, 33, and 58 claim that a user interactive GUI representation is created at the second computer system comprising attributes, content and functionality defined by the extracted attributes, content and functionality of the message, and that the interactive GUI representation is displayed at the second computer system. Thus, in claims 8, 33, and 58, the second computer system receives, renders and acts upon a notification message from the first computer system without the knowledge of and without annoying or the collaboration of other users. It is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 26, 51, 8, 33, and 58 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), which allowance is respectfully requested.

In paragraphs 24-37 of the office action, selected ones of the dependent claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta in combination with various other

references. Is it submitted that the amendments to the independent claims as outlined above make claims depended therefrom allowable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Gupta in combination with the other references, which allowance is respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance, which allowance is respectfully requested.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

/Floyd A. Gonzalez/

FLOYD A. GONZALEZ-Attorney

Registration No. 26,732

Phone: 845-433-7282

Fax: 845-432-9786